

Component 9: Ongoing Compliance Monitoring

- Conduct periodic evaluations to verify ongoing compliance (similar to FPP monitoring).
- Respond to public complaints alleging noncompliance.
- Ensure new owners are made aware of (and have access to) NR 151 compliance information that may pertain to the property they have just acquired.

Question 18: Will your County participate in ongoing compliance activities?

25 Yes	2 No	16 Some But Not All	18 Unsure
--------	------	---------------------	-----------

County	If "Yes" or "Some", which ones and how would compliance be monitored?
Buffalo	The LCD technicians will stop by a structural practice that was installed the previous construction season when he is out completing field work in the current year. Ongoing spot checks is not something we have monitored in the past due to staff time availability. We respond to public complaints right away and make a site visit. We have a huge landowner turnover in Buffalo County and usually need to wait until a landowner comes in and makes us aware of the landowner change, however I mentioned in Question 8 that if the conservation farm plan is not public record then the conservation farm plan will not be public record and available only to the extent that a landowner can review his own farm plan.
Calumet	Because of our limited staffing resources (3 staff), we will not be able to periodically review all evaluated sites for ongoing compliance and complete the review process for all sites in the county. We will likely concentrate on reviewing all sites in the County for compliance first. Monitoring would occur mostly on a complaint basis until the county wide compliance inventory is completed. Once all sites in the county are evaluated, a periodic monitoring system could be put in place. New owners would need to request compliance information. We do not have the staff or technological resources to track new ownership and contact them individually to make them aware of its availability.
Chippewa	Farmland Preservation, other State/County cost-share contracts.
Columbia	All
Crawford	Land & Water Plan prescriptive compliance activities
Dunn	We will continue to monitor the items sited in component 8 or other Best Management Practices where it is required as a condition of the cost share agreement. We do not have the staff to do countywide monitoring.
Fond du Lac	Only as staff time and resources allow.
Grant	(Answered "Some But Not All" on e-file; "Yes" on hard copy) With enough staff, could possibly conduct compliance evaluations and ensure new owners are aware of information, however, do not feel comfortable responding to public complaints. Would be willing to take complaints, but would turn them over to DNR for follow up. Advisory would be an okay position to be in. (e-file) As advisory only. (hard copy)
Juneau	Onsite evaluation/record-keeping
Kewaunee	At this point we're assuming all of them.
Manitowoc	Monitor the priority and critical sites.
Oconto	Check property changes plus a 25% spot check of priority areas. NMP plans will be checked by the new plan submittals for in creased "P" on fields.
Outagamie	Concern is we do not know the details so we are unsure of time, costs, etc.
Ozaukee	?, through site visits.

Pepin	A percentage of landowners, similar to FPP.
Polk	This is going to be related to the amount of state financial assistance that the county receives, we will take care of our priorities, but this is only a portion of the entire rule.
Portage	Would respond to public complaints. No staff to conduct other activities
Richland	Depends on staff time and budget.
Rock	This issue will be outlined in the updated LWRM plan.
St. Croix	Possibly a certain % each year or self-certification by landowners. This is yet to be determined.
Sheboygan	The County would conduct periodic evaluations, respond to complaints, but would not conduct landowner awareness to NR151 compliance due to the costs and time commitment required.
Trempealeau	If staff resources permit we would conduct spot checks and respond to complaints.
Walworth	(#3)Through I&E & door to door
Washburn	1 & 2... Spot checks
Washington	<p>We will conduct periodic onsite evaluations/status reviews as time permits. Reviews will include all standards that apply to the landowners we visit.</p> <p>We may also use a certification system similar to FPP to stay in touch with landowners where compliance has been certified and to have them certify they are following a plan, maintaining cost shared practices and maintaining their compliance status.</p> <p>We will inform new landowners as described in our response to Question 8</p> <p>We will respond to all legitimate public complaints.</p>
Waukesha	Very minimal. Do not anticipate a big need. Mostly complaint based.
Waupaca	We would probably use the same system as Farmland Preservation.
Waushara	Periodic reviews similar to FPPs – may be every 5 to 6 years.
Winnebago	All.

County	If "No", "Unsure" or "Some But Not All", please describe why?
Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas, Iron	(Answered "Some But Not All" and "Unsure", counted as "Unsure" based on comments) Would this be handled similarly to NR 243?
Brown	Brown County will implement state standards that are consistent with existing County Ordinances: Animal Waste Management, Agriculture Shore land Management, Floodplains and Shore lands ordinance provisions related to Buffer Strips. All other work needed to conform to state standards will be conditional upon receiving staff funding from State of Wisconsin unless it is located in an active Priority Watershed Project(with staffing and cost share provided by state) and is an eligible practice.
Clark	Only those landowners that we monitor for other program requirements.
Dane	(No Answer Checked; recorded as "Unsure" based on comments) Within our means, and capabilities
Dodge	Will consider developing some type of on-going monitoring system, but we are unsure how it would work, and unsure whether or not we'll have enough "horses in the barn" to do all this monitoring work in the future.
Eau Claire	See above (Resolve issues as previously stated plus this is entirely dependant upon if the County agrees to implement this)
Green	Depends on staff
Green Lake	It is important for us to know first all the potential complaints that can be raised by the public before deciding if we can do them all.
Iowa	Would consider technical assistance – staff and budget dependent.
Jefferson	Funds and staff
Kenosha	Without more information defining the responsible agencies involved, Kenosha County is unsure of the role it will have in compliance monitoring.
Lafayette	DNR should respond to public complaints. We are not the go to people when land changes hands. Not sure how that will work. Staffing and funding are an issue again.
Langlade	(Did not answer, but comments indicate a strong No) Something the county can't do because of lack of funding and staff
Marathon	We will respond to complaints and work towards periodic evaluations. Workload and tracking system needed.
Marquette	Same issue.....limited staff
Price	You get the idea of where we are coming from.
Racine	Depends on the compliance activities.
Richland	Refer cases to DNR for enforcement.
Rusk	How can we answer this when we don't even know what our initial involvement will be?
Taylor	(hecked Unsure/No; counted as Unsure based on comments) Something we would have a very difficult time doing with the limited staffing available.
Vilas	I'd need to investigate this further with our Corporate Counsel and our Land and Water Conservation Committee

LaCrosse Co.: No submission. New country structure; uncertain how will proceed

Lincoln Co.: No submission, but sent letter. Does not want to commit without additional information about state commitment and funding.

Menomonee Co.: Does not see need for ag performance standards (300 ac. classified as ag use; 0% soil erosion rate.

Pierce Co.: No submission, but sent letter. LCC not able to commit to implementation activities but willing to discuss future role.